

Senate Battle Building On Bigger CIA Body

By HARRY KELLY
Associated Press Writer

Secretary of State Dean Rusk says there is a "tough struggle going on in the back alleys all over the world."

He referred to the dark workings of espionage. Much of it is prosaic research and the feeding of information into data processing machines.

Some of it involves the rarefied world of space science and the brain-busting mathematics of computer codes.

And some of it is hazardous work of nervous men.

So nervous, says Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., that even public Senate debate on the Central Intelligence Agency tends "to chill these sources of information ... might cause them to clam up" in fear for their lives.

Now the CIA finds itself in the limelight of a struggle over a move to change the Senate supervision of the big spy agency.

Panel Expansion Asked

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is asking the Senate to expand the present watchdog panel by adding three of its own members.

The move promises to cause a stiff floor fight—and has already been challenged in debate by members of the present panel, the "secret seven" headed by Sen. Russell, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The others on the panel are senior members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

But a majority of members of the Foreign Relations group—led by Chairman J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., and Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy, D-Minn.—feel they should have a role in the supervision because of their contention that the CIA has influence on U.S. foreign policy decisions.

Involved in the Senate dispute are jealously guarded prerogatives: the general question of whether a bigger group would increase the possibility of dangerous leaks, and the more specific issues of whether the Foreign Relations Committee can keep secrets.

The dispute may come to a boil tomorrow, when Fulbright is expected to introduce the

resolution in the Senate. Russell plans to try to sidetrack it.

Russell, who warned the Senate of the danger of leaks and too much talk about the CIA, said there has never been a "harmful leak" from the members of his CIA group.

The security is so careful, said Sen. Leverett Saltonstall, R-Mass., "we take no notes (at CIA briefings). Any notes that I take for the purpose of asking questions I tear up when we leave."

Sen. Milton R. Young, R-N.D., feels the responsibility strongly: "This is a difficult assignment and sometimes I wish I were not on it. . . one has to be very careful what he says on almost any subject involving foreign affairs where the CIA might be involved."

He said he would not serve on a bigger group because of the danger of leaks.

It was, paradoxically, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Frank J. Lausche, D-Ohio, who pointed a warning finger at his own colleague.

Lausche, who often doesn't see eye to eye with Fulbright, said that the Foreign Relations Committee has "distinguished itself for the frequency of leaks that come out of their hearings."

Russell said he understood Lausche's concern because "I have read articles that were written as a result of information that came out of executive sessions of that committee."

Fulbright, however, said he couldn't see how the resolution "would result in a major, terrible, drastic, catastrophic change in the present situation."

He expressed belief that a revamping of the Senate's CIA panel might quiet some of the criticism over recent incidents such as the CIA's involvement in a Michigan State University foreign aid project.

Furthermore, he said, "I do not believe that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee are any more prone to leak information than anyone else."

STATINTL

MORI/CDF